

Joliet Junior College, IL

Project: Student-focused Comprehensive Placement Process.

Version 1.0- Project

Q: What is the current status of your project?

A: In-progress

Q: Please indicate the original project start date, original project end date, and anticipated completion date if project is not completed. Please list dates on separate lines.

A: Start Date: 12/14/2017

Original Project End Date: 10/15/2018

Expected Completion date: August 2019

Q: Briefly describe the current status of the project. Explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's most recent or soon-to-be submitted systems portfolio, if applicable.

A: The College designed this action project during a strategy forum in late fall 2017. The action project was declared in December 2017. A cross-functional group from the College is working with high school stakeholders to create a less burdensome placement process for students. The intent is to reduce the loss of new students (who may go to other colleges or avoid college altogether), reduce developmental course taking, and provide earlier access to college-level courses.

The committee has met three times. Topics have included:

- Review of existing placement criteria and practices
- Review of student success rates based on previous criteria

- Floor scores and options for students who are not ready for college such as workforce education.
- Co-requisite options
- Using PSAT scores for placement into dual credit
- Developing promotional information to help students and parents better understand placement testing.
- Retesting practices

The committee is on hiatus for the summer and will resume early in the fall semester.

List the project goals as stated in the original project declaration along with the Q: metrics/measures for assessing the progress for each goal.

A: The overall goals for the College are:

- Initial increase in placement with subsequent enrollment in college-level English and mathematics courses by 10%. With associated decrease in developmental education course enrollment.
- Biennial (every two years) evaluation of placement process and revision, if necessary. (One metric/indicator will be the subsequent success rates of students who assessed in the lower 25% quartile for college-level mathematics and English 101 placement.
- Establish a community partnership to provide employment and educational assistance to students who do not meet minimum placement standards. In this partnership, Cornerstone Services would offer Employment Services and Community Services at JJC to meet the needs of student with disabilities who are not able to matriculate into credit courses or need additional supports in credit courses.

The project team will research effective practices, revise college policy and procedures in light of the research, and evaluate results. The project will identify:

- Minimum/floor scores for alternative placement into workforce programs.
- Cut scores for reading, writing, and mathematics.
- Reading-intensive and writing-intensive courses. Courses not included on these lists would be suitable for students with reading and/or writing challenges.
- One or more introductory courses (without college-level math or English prerequisites) in each CTE program so students taking developmental coursework could have a fulltime schedule and complete program requirements.

To determine if the project objectives have been met, the following will be measured:

- Percentage of new students who take placement tests but do not register.
- Percentage increase in enrollment in college-level courses.
- Decrease percentage of ENG 101 credit transferred into the college.

Describe what has been accomplished with this project over the past year, specifically referring to quantifiable results that show progress. You may need to
Q: include a discussion clarifying how the original goals and anticipated outcomes may have shifted during the year.

A: During the past six months, the action team has established goals, engaged in best practice site visits and collected feedback from secondary and social services partners to arrive at a multi-measured approach to placement at Joliet Junior College. As a guidepost for establishing multi-measures at community colleges in Illinois, the Illinois Community College Board has established a set of placement standards. The AQIP Action Team has used these standards to create a new process for placement at JJC.

Describe how various members of the learning community have participated in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration, particularly during the past year.
Q:

A: The AQIP Action Team met four times in spring 2018. Feedback and input was received by both internal and external members of the Team, leading to clarity of purpose for the project and the development of key objectives that are not only measurable but strategic in scope allowing for comprehensive understanding and direct student impact. Team members include:

External

Aimee Feehery, LincolnWay High School

Brian Conant, Joliet Township High School

Nicole McMorris, Joliet Township High School

Dan McDonnell, Plainfield High School

Internal

Randy Fletcher, VPAA

Amy Murphy Applied Arts/Workforce Educ Dean

Dave Naze, Academic Excellence & Support Dean

Michele Smith, Workforce Education Dean

Sonya Williams Arts & Sciences Dean

Patty Zuccarello CTE Dean

Stephanie Braun, Enrollment Management Interim Dean

David Hampton, Academic Skills Center

Jason Fichtel, English faculty

Laura Egner, Math faculty

Terry Kania, Nursing faculty

Teresa Carrillo, English faculty

Rebecca Goad, Math faculty

Dan Warning, Technical faculty

Kristin Ciesemier, Institutional Effectiveness

Describe the effect that this project has had on the institution, students, and others in the learning community. What has the institution learned that can be identified as a good practice to use in other aspects of its quality work or from which other institutions might benefit?

A: The College has decided that charging students for retesting may dissuade students so the College is no longer charging for re-testing. The College has budgeted \$200,000 to cover the cost of retesting.

Describe the anticipated challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.

A: Limiting factors on the project and team include a faculty-centric culture, SIS programming, deadlines for registration, and obtaining consensus across the many stakeholder groups.

Q: In light of the project goals, current circumstances, institutional learning from this project, and anticipated barriers to success, list the next steps to be taken over the

course of the next 12 - 24 months in order to complete or institutionalize the results of this action project. Provide a timeline for completing each next step.

A: Establish the most accurate parameters for placement based on high school curriculum and how requisite mathematics and English courses articulate to JJC within the existing developmental and college-level curriculum. Discussion will include the newly established learning pathways/clusters to ensure seamless entry points to the general education courses and CTE programs of study.

The Action Team will:

- Define the specific knowledge, skill and attributes of a college ready student for reading, writing. Math thinks ALEKS placement is appropriate.
- Evaluates pros and cons of current placement process.
- Propose process based on evidence.
- Use standardized test ACT recommendations. (Use 17 ACT for occupational programs.)
- Creates common guidelines for new process.
- Decide if placement testing is needed for dual credit courses. (Rely on high school faculty to determine if students are qualified to take college level.)
- Create minimum/floor score to ensure ability to benefit and placement into college or workforce program.
- Revise cut scores for reading, writing, and mathematics.
- Determine how many times a test can be taken
- Determine timespan between retesting
- Should students pay for testing? If so, under what circumstances. Free retest with remediation. Can we mandate remediation?
- Present new placement processes to President and President's Leadership Council for approval.
- Pilot multiple methods to determine placement.
- Develop a list of reading-intensive and writing-intensive courses. Courses not included on these lists would be suitable for students with reading and/or writing challenges. Provide a list of courses (without college-level math or English prerequisites) for students at pre-college placement levels so they can carry a full-time schedule.
- Develop a list of introductory courses in each CTE program so students taking developmental coursework could have a full-time schedule and complete program requirements.
- Create evaluation indicators for the process

Implementation of Revised Placement Process

- Consider IT programming constraints
 - April 2019: Colleague programming.
- Avoid changes during registration period.

- May 2019: Plan in place
- Fall 2019: Impact students
- AY18-19: Educate advisors. Communication of process to JJC faculty and staff
- AY18-19: Educate Stakeholders. Communication of process to high school faculty and staff
- SP19: Catalog text updated. Avoid changes during registration period and manual re-entry.
- SP19: Update Websites and portal text. Avoid changes during registration period and manual re-entry.
- FL19: Implement placement process.

Provide any additional information, inquiries, or concerns that the institution wishes Q: reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project. Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: N/A

Version 1.0- Update

Q: I certify that this project is ready for review.

A: I agree.

Version 1.0- Review

Please comment on anything that is omitted or incomplete in the project status, Q: dates and summary field. Enter N/A if not applicable.

A: N/A

Q: Check for accuracy and completeness against the original Project Declaration. Are the right metrics or measures included for each goal? If not, what revisions to the metrics/measures would you suggest that the institution consider?

A: Joliet Junior College developed an Action Project aimed at designing and deploying a more refined and less burdensome placement process for students. The hope was to reduce the loss of new students, to reduce developmental courses taken and to provide earlier access to college-level courses.

Researching effective student placement practices, revising college policies and procedures based upon the research, and devising an evaluation process and metrics for measuring effectiveness were/are the primary goals. Numeric targets were defined while research being done and communicating the process changes are to be measured by completion.

Has the institution acted in meaningful ways to pursue project success, making progress as anticipated in the original project declaration? If meaningful progress or project success has not been achieved, has the institution made appropriate revisions to the goals or anticipated outcomes for this project? • Are descriptions of resources, organization, concrete results, and reaching milestones included? • Make a statement of global judgment. (i.e. “The institution is making [excellent/good/satisfactory/ acceptable/slow/ casual/no] progress in this action project.”).

A: A cross-functional team from the college and representative high school stakeholders met three times during the 2017-2018 academic year. Topics of discussion included reviewing existing placement criteria, practices, and student success rates, along with possible floor scores, co-requisite options, using PSAT scores for placement into dual credit, promotional material development, and re-testing practices. Specific targets for placement into college-level coursework, a bi-annual review process of placement procedures, and a community partnership to help with employment of those not able to meet minimum standards have been considered.

Best practice site visits and collected feedback from secondary and social service partners have also transpired. Also to be considered are the Illinois Community College Board's set of placement standards. While these aforementioned have been completed, no particulars or justifications have been provided other than the target of a 10% increase placement into college-level classes have been provided. The progress appears good, there are few specifics to support any reviewer evaluation. More explanation for processes and rationales for decisions is needed to fairly appraise the work done thus far.

Q: Are the appropriate people involved sufficiently for the nature and scope of the project?

• Is there sufficient breadth of involvement?

• Are the right people involved? • Emphasize the roles of those who can enhance the impact, success, or effectiveness of the project.

• Tactfully call attention to any people that appear to have been omitted or bypassed.

A: The Action Project team is broad-based with both internal and external participants. Four high school representatives and fifteen Joliet employees are guiding this project. College employees represent administration and faculty and the Academic Skills Center and Institutional Effectiveness. The team appears to be well-balanced for the job at hand.

Does the institution show evidence of learning from what it did well?

Q: • Acknowledge any practice that could be replicated internally in future projects.
• Encourage the sharing of best practices with other institutions.

A: The college has updated its "student re-take" process no longer requiring students to pay for that service. No other change or evidence of learning was shared.

Does the institution have a realistic understanding of what it needs to address in order to achieve progress and, ultimately, project success? Does it assess its internal and external environments, recognizing the potential forces that could hinder success? Is anything overlooked?

A: Joliet recognizes a faculty-centric culture, SIS programming, registration deadlines, and gaining consensus among stakeholder groups as potential challenges as the project is continued. In spite of these concerns, goals remain the same and timelines for implementation have been defined.

Working hard on the communication components of the Action Project and keeping all stakeholders informed of the progress being made, the rationales for specific decisions, and the importance of student success, may support the project. The *Principles of High Performance Organizations*, focus on stakeholders and respecting people will also be supported through diligence in communicating project progress.

Does the institution understand the current status of its project and know how it intends to pursue project success?

A: Joliet understands and is prepared to meet the challenges of completing this Action Project.

Q: Overall, does the institution demonstrate a good faith effort in its pursuit of continuous quality improvement through this action project? Is there anything of concern that should be brought to the attention of AQIP via your mentor?

A: Joliet Junior College demonstrates concern for student success and commitment to providing the support necessary to improve the teaching/ learning environment across its campus.

Declaration

Q: Briefly describe the project in less than 100 words. Be sure to identify the key organizational areas (departments, programs, divisions, units, etc.) and key organizational processes that this action project will affect, change, and/or improve.

A: This project will implement a student-focused comprehensive process to assess student readiness for college and placement into appropriate courses and programs. The project team will research effective practices, revise college policy and procedures in light of the research, and devise an evaluation with metrics/indicators. The project will identify:

- Minimum/floor scores for alternative placement into workforce programs.
- Cut scores for reading, writing, and mathematics.
- Reading-intensive and writing-intensive courses. Courses not included on these lists would be suitable for students with reading and/or writing challenges.
- One or more introductory courses (without college-level math or English prerequisites) in each CTE program so students taking developmental coursework could have a fulltime schedule and complete program requirements in a timely sequence.

Q: Describe your institution's reasons for initiating this action project now and how long it should take to complete it. Why are this project and its goals high among your institution's current priorities? Also, explain how this project relates to any strategic initiatives or challenges described in the institution's recent or soon-to-be submitted Systems Portfolio.

A: The college must become more student-centered to attract and retain students. We want to reduce the loss of new students (who may go to other colleges or avoid college altogether) with a less burdensome process for college-level placement. Students will have the opportunity to access college-level courses earlier in their pathway to

completion. Students may also be placing into/completing unnecessary courses which delay graduation.

Currently, the English and mathematics testing processes have different fees, number of retakes, expiration dates, retake wait-time, etc. Faculty will benefit from increased knowledge related to placement scores and their impact on student perceptions. Anecdotal information, rather than research, has been used to establish some placement standards. Students are not receiving sufficient counseling and advising to enable effective use of program pathways.

Previous placement policies were developed without including the perspectives of our underlying high school stakeholders.

Q: List the project goals, milestones, and deliverables along with corresponding metrics, due dates, and other measures for assessing the progress toward each goal. Be sure to include when you anticipate submitting the project for formal reviews.

A: Goals:

- Initial increase in placement with subsequent enrollment in college-level English and mathematics courses by 10%. With associated decrease in developmental education course enrollment.
- Biennial (every two years) evaluation of placement process and revision, if necessary. (One metric/indicator will be the subsequent success rates of students who assessed in the lower 25% quartile for college-level mathematics and English 101 placement.

MILESTONES, DELIVERABLES, DUE DATES, AND METRICS

Proposal done by May 15, 2018. Feedback and buy-in completed by October 15, 2018. Student notices and Colleague programming finished by April 2018.

Communication

- Clarify purpose to Stakeholders = Remove barriers to enrollment
 - English and mathematics department meeting update and strategy for change meetings: completed by May 2018.
- Updates to placement cut scores communicated to all internal constituents; October 2018
- AQIP Action Projects are by definition a College Priority; VPAA address to faculty – January 2018

Establish Boundaries for Action Team

- Convene action team and present the project charter and scope of work. Purpose and Ground rules. Consensus and inclusion. Multiple measures (GPA, Class rank, grade in course). All the faculty take the placement test and have to pass to be on the team.

The Action Team will:

- Define the specific knowledge, skill and attributes of a college ready student for reading, writing. Math thinks ALEKS placement is appropriate.
 - Evaluates pros and cons of current placement process.
 - Propose process based on evidence.
 - Use standardized test ACT recommendations. (Use 17 ACT for occupational programs.)
 - Creates common guidelines for new process.
 - Decide if placement testing is needed for dual credit courses. (Rely on high school faculty to determine if students are qualified to take college level.)
 - Create minimum/floor score to ensure ability to benefit and placement into college or workforce program.
 - Cut scores for reading, writing, and mathematics.
 - Determine how many times a test can be taken
 - Determine timespan between retesting
 - Should students pay for testing? If so, under what circumstances. Free retest with remediation. Can we mandate remediation.
 - Pilot multiple methods to determine placement.
 - Develop a list of reading-intensive and writing-intensive courses. Courses not included on these lists would be suitable for students with reading and/or writing challenges. Provide a list of courses (without college-level math or English prerequisites) for students at pre-college placement levels so they can carry a full-time schedule.
 - Develop a list of introductory courses in each CTE program so students taking developmental coursework could have a fulltime schedule and complete program requirements.
 - Create evaluation indicators for the process.
-
- February 2018: Current college testing subject matter experts (SME) will document current placement process (policies, procedures) and rationale. These materials will be a reference for the action team. Deliverable: Current Placement Process, a document with all current placement testing information.
 - February 2018: Request \$200.000 for cost of placement testing, if students are not charged.
 - Date TBD: The placement process presented to PLC and approved by President and Cabinet

Timely Implementation of Revised Placement Process

- Consider IT programming constraints
 - April 2018: Colleague programming.
- Avoid changes during registration period.
- Plan in place - May 2018
- Plan complete April 2019
- Impact students Fall 2019
- Date TBD: Educate advisors. Communication of process to JJC faculty and staff
- Date TBD: Educate Stakeholders. Communication of process to high school faculty and staff
- Date TBD: Catalog text updated. Avoid changes during registration period and manual re-entry.
- Date TBD: Update Websites and portal text. Avoid changes during registration period and manual re-entry.
- Date TBD: Implement placement process.

Evaluation of Revised Placement Process

- Five question survey
- Increase % students who test and enroll
- Increased % enrollment in college-level courses
- Success rates/grades of students and faculty feedback from instructors in ENG 101 and college-level math.
- Decrease number of ENG 101 credits transferred in to JJC.
- Floor score implemented and students placing below referred to Workforce Education department for placement.

Q: Describe how various members of the learning community will participate in this action project. Show the breadth of involvement by individuals and groups over the project's duration.

A: To carry out the project, the project leader and action team (Sonya Williams, Stephanie Braun, Sarena Lee, Jason Fichtel, Teresa Carillo, Laura Egner, Rebecca Goad, Dan Warning, Year 1 Nursing Faculty/ Terry Kania, Dan McDonnell, Plainfield West, Associate Principal Joliet Township, Amy Freeny, Lincoln-Way High school District) will involve stakeholders from Mathematics Department, English Department, District 525 high schools, students, IT, disability services, Student Development, and CTE faculty to establish the most accurate parameters for placement based on high school curriculum and how requisite mathematics and English courses articulate to JJC within the existing developmental and college-level curriculum. Discussion will include the newly established learning pathways/clusters to ensure seamless entry points to the general education courses and CTE programs of study.

The action team will meet bi-weekly until project is completed and the Center for Excellence will provide professional development and norming activities for high school dual credit and college faculty; share credible, trusted data on matriculation rates, HS student subsequent student in English and mathematics courses in pre-college and college-level courses and longitudinal success data relative to persistence and completion.

Q: Describe how the institution will monitor project progress/success during, and at the completion of this project. Be sure to specifically state the measures that will be evaluated and when.

A: To determine if the project objectives have been met, the following will be measured:

- Percentage of new students who take placement tests but do not register.
- Percentage increase in enrollment in college level courses.
- Decrease in percentage of ENG 101 credit transferred into the college.

Q: Describe the challenges that may be encountered in successfully completing the project or for institutionalizing the learning from the project's goals.

A: For success, the project will need buy-in from all stakeholders, IT capability, and faculty willingness to amend teaching strategies (e.g. use learning labs).

Limiting factors on the project and team include a faculty-centric culture, SIS programming, deadlines for registration, and obtaining consensus across the many stakeholder groups. The project has the freedom to set placement scores.

Faculty may not want to lower scores for fear they are lowering standards in their course. Faculty have expressed that they do not want to babysit students who are not college-ready

Risks = Realigning curriculum. With floor scores, ENG 020 may be eliminated (approximately 12 sections per semester). Re-evaluation of credentials for teaching developmental courses.

Q: Provide any additional information that the institution wishes reviewers to understand regarding this Action Project.

A: None

